

The abstract is rechecked again to see the possibility to make it in a better language and more narrative form if this won't cause a loss of a complete cover of engine's description with such contents and accessories (a market up & clean copies Enc.).

3- In the specification : concerning the edition of April 12, 2002.

Page 7 , line 23-24 : This information was clearly shown on the unchanged drawings and it needed to be explained in the text after your first action to facilitate the understanding of how the criteria of physical principles (reflected reactions) are able to function inside this device.

It was to declare this detail as it had been already designed and existed in the drawings. The pistons in all the options of this system were at angle $> 45^\circ$ (C. L. with wheel Tangent).

Pages 20, 21,22,23,24 : The already existing article was extended with more information and more specific explanations on how those physical criteria are functioning , this was according to your request on the first action and your inquiry about employing those principles in this device, this could be much longer as so far the researches continue , it is to make it much easy to be understood by a skilled readers while every thing is still connected to this device.

The market up copy of that edition of April 12, 2001 was already sent with it (as its Enc.).

Page 5, line 1-2 : I couldn't figure the exact words but any how it is to briefly mention some details that that declared later on in the text but in other place and nothing else.

Please recognize the participation of many concepts in the performance of this engine that will lead to add more declarations as far as its researches continue .

4- The claims (Claims objections)

4-1 // On Claim 1 for the informalities concerning lines 28,23,29 and 30

It is corrected as appropriate as possible but also to briefly cover all the prescription for this engine with a marked up copies and clean copies (Enc.)

4-2 // The other claims (1-30) are rechecked again to be as appropriate as possible with a market up copies (Enc.).

4-3 // Claim Objections :

On Claims 1-3 :- Pls. go to pages 20 - 24.

On Claim 1, line 15 :- a declaration sentence will be added as :

- contains wings that designed to employ (Bernoulli's Concepts) when these speedily gases flowing through them to produce a relative physical reaction that could act on or as inverse direction i.e. to rotate the cylinder within its wheel , (this may be clear enough for skilled readers).

On Claim 2 lines 1-5 :- Pls. go to pages 20 - 28. that explained all the concepts more easily and specifically.

4-4 // Independent and dependent Claims :-

Please recognize that when a complete new design managing an engine could lead to have many intellectual characteristics all to be appeared in its performance , in my view this may add many claims to be considered as independent , however it is your position to decide that.

Although an experience may need to have progress in a patent office as well as the science.

5- On claims (Claim rejections) :

5-1// Inoperative device from a view of the examiner :

Please recognize a chamber of all fixed surrounding walls as in A Closed Pocket Turbine.

And a chamber of one wall facing the fuel ignition is a deflectable (as a movable wall if it is reacted by a force) to deflect under a force of gas expansion due to fuel-mixture explosion inside this chamber. This wall will transfer the force to its flexible push-arm and then a certain magnitude to its base to act as a sway pocket to rotate its wheel , this is the concept of the automatic refill principle used in the fast shooting canons.

While that magnitude will increase gradually when changing the a circular wheel device from a static status to a dynamic status relatively with its dynamic speed .

Pls. go to page 20 -22.

5-2// claims rejected since it appears to have conflicted many principles:-

A request (by the examiner) to provide prototype or/and affidavits from a well known US expert(s) .

This request was mentioned at the 1st action , in my previous reply I have asked USPTO to issue the affidavits directly from any reference as a mandate by its authority , I thought that you know the circumstances of the long term of such political situation and sanction . In fact I tried to inform you indirectly on this matter .

There was that US Gov. Law of sanction even forbidding any Am. scientific individual to cooperate with any Iraqis during all that time , a policy that leads to this war crisis on Iraq which made the situation worst , that Law apparently has been lifted last month . !!!

The applicant is an Iraqi who entered USPTO after PCT despite of those circumstances, but unfortunately his application has been effected in some how by all those stated factors .

It is due to this repeated request , the applicant should have more time to find a way to fulfill certain mandate under normal circumstances whether if it is possible now after all those events .

Should the applicant need more chance as to be exceptional regarding those factors? To make him able to contact such Am. experts for affidavits or other requirements .

Since there is a certain situation that enables to deal with an application as (case by case) in USPTO Law according to a reality of this principle (an equal opportunity for all).

The reasonable answer would be : Yes indeed .

However it the US community and this office who will benefit from such a patent.

That's why I have to appeal USPTO to have more legal time on the prosecution of this application and this would be in a separate letter .